



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

*Studies of Sanskrit Words.*—By EDWIN W. FAY, Professor  
in the University of Texas, Austin, Texas.

## I. Arváñc-

IN his German etymological dictionary (English translation, s.v. Erde) Kluge, with some hesitation, connects Lat. *arvum* ‘field, ploughed land’ with Gr. ἐπαξε ‘earthwards.’ In his English Etymology, s.v. earth, all this hesitation disappears, in view, I take it, of ON. *jorvi* ‘ground,’ not cited in the former work among the cognates. It is also to be noted that Vergil (Aen. 12,681) uses *arvis* as a virtual rendering of Gr. χαμάξε ‘to the ground.’

There is a very obvious difficulty in the comparison of *arvum* with ἐπαξε, viz., the vocalism. This difficulty may be surmounted, to the best of my knowledge, in but one way, by assuming a base ēr- ‘arare,’ to which the European base ar-(from er-) would belong. This solution I have offered in my essay entitled A Semantic Study of the Indo-Iranian Nasal Verbs (Am. Jr. Phil., 26,389). There is, it must be admitted, not very much to justify a base ēr-. Skr. árá ‘awl’: Gr. ἀπίς ‘auger’ is dubious because of OHG. ála. Latin óra ‘edge, point,’ is also ambiguous, and so is ēr ‘stachel-schwein,’ which may well be for ‘her’, if Hesychian χῆρ is genuine Greek, with a genuine χ. Not very conclusive is Skr. íriṇam (? from er-) “brüchiges, unfruchtbare Land.” A vague connection with the root might be made out for Gr. ἔριφος ‘kid’ (if =“pricket”): Lat. *aries* ‘ram’ (cf. Umbr. *erietu*): Lith. éras (with ē) ‘lamb.’ But in any case, the vowel relations of *arvum* and ἐπαξε are no harder to admit than those of Lat. *aries*: Umbr. *erietu*.

As a means of testing the correlation of *arvum* with ἐπαξε I have made a study of the Sanskrit word arváñc-, as it appears in the Rig-Veda, and I attach some importance to the isolation of its formation, with the adverbial suffix -añc-, as compared with the isolated Greek word ἐπαξε. I conclude from the data that follow that arváñc- and the adverb arvák do mean “earthward(s).”

1. The Petersburg Lexica define our word as follows: a) herwaerts kommend, hergekehrt, zugekehrt, entgegen-kommend: b) diesseitig (only in grammatical and lexicographical sources, save the adverb *arvák*, which has literary attestation): c) unterhalb befindlich, nach unten gerichtet: d) in der Nähe von (advb. only). The earliest citations for the sense c) are from AV. and SB., and consist of passages in which *arváñc-* is contrasted with *ūrdhvás*. This contrast I would, however, see in RV. vii. 78. 1bc (B<sub>2</sub>)<sup>1</sup>:

ūrdhvá asyā añjáyo ví śrayante,  
úṣo arváca br̥hatá ráthena—vāmám asmábhyam vakṣi,  
“On high her rays are spreading abroad,  
<Now> Uṣas earthward in thy mighty car wealth to us  
fetch.”

This hymn may belong to a late middle period of RV. tradition as Arnold believes (see the table in PAOS. xviii. 353, and KZ. xxxiv. 341), but the chronology of the Vedic hymns can hardly tell against a word proved to be proethnic; and a hymn of the earliest period, if liable to popular rather than hieratic use, may have retained in all its working-over very-early linguistic material (cf. Bloomfield, Proceedings, xxi. 41 ff. *pace* Arnold, *ibid.* xxii. 309 ff.).

2. Contexts are not wanting in RV. where a special sense seems warranted for *arváñc-*. Thus in i. 92. 16 (A),

—vartír asmád<sup>2</sup> á . . . arvág rátham . ní yachatam  
“unto our house—earthward—your chariot bring”,

*arvág* might well be taken as a mere adverbial repetition of *vartís*, and passages are still to be pointed out in which *arvák* seems to mean “ad nostrum fundum.” In some of these contexts previous translators have recognized the sense I would give to *arváñc-*, and Sāyaṇa glosses *arvák* in v. 45. 10 (see 5 below) by *avāñmukhāḥ* ‘face-downwards.’

<sup>1</sup> After each hymn I put Arnold's indication of its age: A, archaic: B<sub>1</sub>, early middle period: B<sub>2</sub>, late middle period: C<sub>1</sub>, early late period: C<sub>2</sub>, later late period.

<sup>2</sup> This takes *asmád* as a poss. adj. = ‘nostrum’, identical with the compounding stem *asmad*.

viii. 14. 8 (B<sub>2</sub>):

úd gá ājad áñgirobhya āvís kr̄ṇván gúhā satíh  
arváñcam nunude valám,

“Showing the hidden, he drove forth the cows for the  
Añgirases,  
And Vala he cast headlong down” (so Griffith).

That arváñcam nunude means ‘struck to the ground’ = (‘to his feet,’ cf. RV. i. 32. 8, B<sub>2</sub>) seems to me most probable. Note the combination of the root nud with ūrdhvám ‘upwards’ in i. 85. 10 (B<sub>2</sub>); i. 88. 4 (A).

Wilson, cited by Griffith, paraphrased x. 71. 9a (C<sub>1</sub>),

imé yé nárváñ ná parás<sup>1</sup> cáranti,

by “Those who do not walk (with the Brahmans) in this  
lower world, nor (with the gods) in the upper world.”

3. In the following passages arváñc- is combined with the root sad ‘to sit.’

iii. 4. 8cd (B<sub>2</sub>): sárasvatí sárasvatébhir àrvák  
. . . barhír édám sadantu,

“May Sarasvati and her confluent rivers earthward  
(come) . . . and sit down upon this grass.”

x. 15. 4a (C<sub>1</sub>): bárhíṣadah pitara ūty àrvág,

“Grass-sitting Manes come earthward to our aid (or  
with aid).”

4. In the following the contrast of earth and heaven is clear.

i. 45.10ab (A): arváñcam dáivyam jánam ágne yáksva,

“Fetch-by-sacrifice to earth the celestial kind, O Agni.”

v. 83. 6cd (C<sub>1</sub>) arváñ eténa stanayitnúnéhy

apó niśiñcánn ásurah pitá nah.

“Earthward in this thunder come,  
dripping water, god our father.”

vi. 19. 9cd (B<sub>2</sub>): á viśváto abhí sám etv arváñ

índra dyumnám svàrvad dhehy asmé,

“From every side let him come earthward:  
Indra, bestow upon us heavenly glory.”

<sup>1</sup> On parás, see 6 below.

vii. 83. 3 (B<sub>2</sub>): sám bhúmyā ántā dhvasirá adrksata  
 índrāvaraṇā diví ghóṣa áruhat  
 ásthur jánānām úpa mām árātaýo  
 arvág ávasā havanaśrutā gatam.

“The earth-ends were seen dust-bewhirled;  
 Indra-Varuna, my cry mounted to heaven:  
 My enemies among the peoples encompassed me:  
 Earthward with help, hearing my cry, ye came.”

x. 83. 6a-c (C<sub>1</sub>): úpa méhy arváñ—mányo vajrinn—  
 “Come earthward to me, lightning wielder, Manyu.”

5. In the large majority of instances arváñc- is of vague significance. The gods are called upon to come and bless the worshipper. Obviously “come hither” makes a satisfying rendering for arváñ yāhi, but “come down, come earthward” were equally satisfying. Arguing from the antiquity of the agricultural rites of worship, attested for instance at Rome in the ritual of the Fratres Arvales, and mindful of the etymological sense of ‘ploughland’ found in arvum, one might feel disposed to make something of

iv. 57. 6ab (C<sub>1</sub>): arvácī subhage bhava síte vándāmahe  
 tvā,

“Earthward, gracious one, turn thou, Furrow, we greet  
 thee.”

Still, as so many other deities are summoned earthward, we can hardly lay much weight on the summoning of the “Furrow” earthward.

The following passages, though vague, have seemed, for one reason or another,<sup>1</sup> worthy of consideration.

ii. 37. 5ab (B<sub>2</sub>): arváñcam adyá yayyàm nrváhaṇam  
 rátham yuñjāthām ihá vām vimócanam.

“To come earthward to-day your man-bearing  
 Car hitch up; here is your unhitching.”

Here arváñcam is not attributive, but predicative, a sort of factitive to yuñjāthām; unless construed closely with yayyàm.

<sup>1</sup> Chiefly because they show arváñc- in combination, not directly with a verb of motion, but with one equal, by a sort of zeugma, to a verb of motion.

iv. 4. 8a (B<sub>2</sub>): árcāmi te sumatím ghóṣy arvák,  
“I sing thy grace; sound it <back> to earth.”

v. 45. 10cd (B<sub>1</sub>): udná ná návam anayanta dhírā  
āśrṇvatír ápo arvág<sup>1</sup> atiṣṭhan,  
“Like a ship in water the wise launched him (the sun);  
The hearkening floods <of light descended> to earth  
and stood <there>.

vii. 18. 3c (B<sub>2</sub>): arvácī te pathyà rāyá etu,  
“Earthward (? ad fundum nostrum) come thy path of  
wealth, <Indra>.

vii. 28. 1b (A): arváñcas te hárayah santu yuktáḥ,  
“Earthward be thy steeds yoked, <Indra>.”

viii. 61 (50). 1 (A): ubháyám śṛṇávac ca na índro arvág  
idáṁ vácāḥ  
satrácyā maghávā sómapítaye dhiyá śáviṣṭha á gamat.  
“Let Indra hearken earthward to this our double song;  
<Moved> by our unanimous prayer, let Maghavan, the  
mighty, come hither to drink soma.”

x. 89. 5d (B<sub>2</sub>): nárvág índram pratimánāni debhuḥ,  
“Nor have any counterfeits decoyed Indra to earth.”

x. 89. 16d (B<sub>2</sub>): tiró vísvāň árcato yāhy arván,  
“Past all (other) praisers (?), come down to earth”  
(ad fundum nostrum: cf. vii. 18. 3, and paragraph  
2, above).

x. 129. 6c (C<sub>2</sub>): arvág devá asyá visárjanena.  
“The gods are later than this world’s production”  
(Griffith).

No translation of this passage is likely to win conviction, even from its proposer, but I venture on

“<There came> gods to earth at its creation.”

6. I have reserved two passages for separate treatment.

i. 164. 19ab (C<sub>1</sub>): yé arváñcas tāň u párāca āhur  
yé párāñcas tāň u arváca āhur,

---

<sup>1</sup> Note the gloss of Sāyaṇa, mentioned above at the beginning of 2.

“The down <on the earth> they call the up <in the sky>;  
 The up <in the sky> they call the down <on the earth>.”

In this stanza we have some astronomical or cosmogonic riddle, and a real solution I do not pretend to offer,<sup>1</sup> but it is probable that párañc- here repeats pára- in stanzas 17 and 18, where pára-<sup>2</sup> connotes ‘heavenly,’ as in the same stanzas ávara-, echoed in stanza 19 by arváñc-, connotes ‘earthly.’ This interpretation shows points of agreement with Wilson’s paraphrase of x. 71. 9a (see in 2 above).

viii. 8. 23 (A): tríñi padány aśvínor āvih sánti gúhā  
 paráh

kaví rtásya pátmabhir arvág jivébhyaś pári,

“The three regions of the Aśvins are revealed  
 <which were> in hiding in-the-far-heaven;  
 The two seers of righteousness wing-their-way earthward  
 unto the living.”

The translation of paráh by “in-the-far-heaven” (= German “jenseits”), rather than by “before,” seems to me beyond question; and this would seem to fasten the sense of “earthward” upon arvák.

After the above tests of the special applicability of the rendering “earthward,” it seems not amiss to regard Skr. arváñc- as a cognate of Gr. ἐπαρξε, Lat. arvis (in Aeneid 12. 681).

#### *Postscript.*

The editors have asked me to add, for completeness’ sake, a word on (1) arváciná- (arváciña-) and (2) arvávát-. It is habitual to render (1)—construed like Lat. sublimis (Gildersleeve-Lodge’s Gram. §325. 6)—by ‘hitherward’ (= ‘to the worshipper, to me’), rather than by ‘earthward,’ and in all the usage of the word (fifteen cases) there is nothing, as Professor Hopkins observes, to prove the inadequacy of the usual rendering. The

<sup>1</sup> But we may note the Vergilian usage, Aen. 6. 481, of superi = ‘qui in terra (supra terram) sunt,’ for the usual superi = ‘caelestes.’

<sup>2</sup> See Grassmann’s Lexicon, s.vv. pára-, paramá-.

one difficult use is RV. vi. 25. 3 (A, in Arnold's system of dates) :

índra jāmáya utá yé 'jāmayo  
'rvācīnásō vanúṣo yuyujré  
tvám esāṁ vithurá sávāñsi  
jahí vŕṣnyāni kṛṇuhí párācaḥ,

as to which Grassmann remarks in his Lexicon that here alone arvācinā- is used of other than friendly approach. But there need be no question of approach at all, for we may well take jāmayah and ájāmayah as adjectives and arvācinásah as a substantive, in formation something like arvales, but in sense like vicini (finitum) or Landsleute. The stanza does not lose in point thereby:

Indra, our kindred and non-kindred  
Neighbours, that as enemies have united,—  
Do thou in sunder their mightiness  
Rive, their prowess; make them as strangers (=drive  
them afar).

In the study of arvāvát 'proximity,' the salient fact is that it is never used save as an antonym of parāvát 'distance;' but, after a consideration of all the examples in RV., I feel free to say that 'distance' is not the only signification of parāvát (and its kin). Grassmann's Lexicon s.vv. pára- paramá-, suggests 'heaven' as a rendering, and renders parástāt by 'oberhalb'; while both Grassmann and the larger Petersburg Lexicon interpret tisrás parāvátah by 'the three regions' (sky, air, and earth).

The connotation of 'sky' or 'air' ('aloft, on high') seems to me probable—what connotation is mathematically demonstrable? —for this group in the following instances. In iv. 26. 6 (B2) the falcon brings the soma-stalk from the parāvát (a-b), having taken it divó amúsmād úttarāt 'from yon remote sky' (d), and pādas ab, without the interpretative clause d, recur in substance in x. 144. 4 (A). In iv. 21. 3 (A), Indra is besought to come from (1) diváh 'the sky,' (2) pr̥thivyáh 'the land,' (3) samudrád . . púriṣāt 'the sea-of-air,—i. e., from the three regions already mentioned: the stanza then adds (4) svàrṇarāt 'from the light-realms' and (5) parāváto vā sádanād rtásya; I interpret (4) as a substantial repetition of (1) and in (5) I take sádanād rtásya, which Sāyaṇa glosses by meghalokāt 'from the cloud-space,' as a synonymous (explanatory) apposition with

parāvátah (which Ludwig renders by an adjective): thus (5) = ‘from parāvát, the cloud-space.’ In. vi. 8. 4 (B<sub>2</sub>) Mātariśvan is said to have brought Agni down from (his hiding place in) parāvát, while in x. 187. 5 (B<sub>2</sub>) Agni’s birthplace is given as páré rájasah ‘in the far-off of the air.’ In v. 53. 8 the Aśvins are summoned from the sky (diváḥ), the air (antárikṣāt), and from here (amát), and besought not to remain afar, parāvátah ‘from (=in) the parāvát. Further, note viii. 12. 17 (A):

yád vā śakra parāváti samudré ádhi mánḍase  
asmákam ít suté raṇā sám índubhīḥ,

“Whether, O Might, thou joyest in parāvát in the sea  
<of air> [So Griffith supplies]  
Delight in our pressing,” etc.

In addition to these examples of the connotation ‘sky’ (air) for parāvát (párám), we may note the contrasting pair ávara-lower (and) paramá- ‘highest,’ especially in i. 164. 17 (C,) aváḥ páreṇa pará ená ‘vareṇa’. In the light of such instances we may note that in the remote Celtic branch Ir. eross, which Stokes (Fick’s Woert.<sup>1</sup> II. p. 37) gives as a cognate of Skr. pará-, means ‘height,’ which would tend to vindicate the sense of ‘high’ for proethnic pero-.

If parāvát means ‘sky,’ what of its antonym arvāvát? Note viii. 13. 15 (A):

yác chakrási parāváti yád arvāváti vṛtrahan  
yád vā samudré ándhaso ’vitéd asi,

“Whether, O Might, thou art in parāvát, or in arvāvát,  
Vṛtra- slayer,  
Or else in the sea <of air>, thou art the protector of the  
Soma-stalk.”

If we are right in taking samudré of the ‘air,’ then páraváti and arvāváti are the sky and earth, respectively.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> [Observe, however, that the same words are repeated in viii. 97 (86). 4, but filled out (after the invitation is given) in 5 as follows: yád vāsi rocané diváḥ samudrásyā’ dhi viṣṭápi, yát párthive sádane vṛtrahantama yád antárikṣa ā gábi, “or if thou art in the sky’s brightness, (or) on the sea’s expanse, (or) if on earth’s seat, (or) if in the interspace (air), do thou come hither,” where ‘sea’ is distinct from air, and earth and sky are separately contrasted. Ed.]

The semantic problem may be stated as follows: pará- meant (1) 'distant, far' but came, by a connotation which may have been proethnic, to mean (2) 'high, in the sky;' its antonym, arváñc-, meant (1) 'earthwards, towards (on) the ground' but developed, under the influence of pará (1), the meaning (2) 'near.'

The following illustration furnishes an approximate parallel. In Latin, domi (domum) and apud me (ad me) became, in a restricted sense, synonymous: 'at (to) my house.' These synonyms must have played a rôle in the upgrowth of domo doctus for ā me doctus and of domi habeo aliquid for mihi est aliquid (cf. Lorenz ad Mil. Glor. 194), wherein the sense of 'domus' has nearly vanished. Similar is the generalisation of *θípače* 'out,' French fors / hors ('Lat. foris), from which the sense of 'door' has vanished, almost or wholly; and in French chez the sense of Lat. casa is all but gone; and we no longer think of a hill when we say down or adown. In general, on such prepositional words (direction adverbs) derived from nouns, consult Steinthal-Misteli, *Abriss der Sprachwissenschaft*,<sup>2</sup> II, §4, p. 11 ff., noting especially Skr. párśvam párśve- 'adversus, ad, apud, prope.'

To say briefly what I think of the morphology of the group under discussion, I explain arváñc as a terminal accusative \*arvam (or plur. \*arván) + a deictic particle \*-c(a), comparable with Gr. -δε; \*-c(a) may be compared with Lat. -ce, and if it belongs to a different guttural series, the reason is that \*arvamš- has been attracted into a group with the other direction adverbs in -āñc-. Alongside of arvácīná RV. exhibits a pretty large group of which prácīna and praticīná may be taken as representatives; arvāvát is not to be explained as from arváñc, but merely as a counterpart of parāvát.

## 2. Náhus-.

In RV. viii. 8. 23 (above), the words tríni padáni call for interpretation: what are the three pádas? Sáyana interpreted them as the three wheels of the Aśvins' chariot. Griffith says heaven, firmament, earth. But the hymn itself mentions three places from which the Aśvins come, viz., náhus- (stz. 3), antárikṣa- (3, 4), dyāús (4, 7). Dyāús we know and antárikṣa- we seem to know, but what is náhus? I believe náhus to be 'the night,'

cf. Gr. *νύχα* · *νύκτωρ*, ἔννυχος. This interpretation yields good results when applied to

vii. 6. 5bcd (B<sub>2</sub>): *yó aryápatnir usásas cakára*  
*sá nirúdhyā náhuso yahvó agnúr*  
*víśaś cakre balihṛtah sáhobhiḥ,*  
 “Agni made the dawns noble-spoused,  
 Driving off the nights, strong Agni  
 Made the peoples tribute-bringers by his might.”

Here note the opposition of *usásas* and *náhusas*.

The base to which I ascribe Gr. *νύχα* and *náhus* is *s)nō(w)-gh-*, alternating with *s)nē(y)-gh-*, and refer for my conception of the phonetic problems involved to Am. Jr. Phil. xxv. 371 ff. 379 ff. Stripped of “root-determinatives,” the base in simpler form is *s)nē(y)-/s)nō(w)-*, and meant “to wrap,” cf. Skr. *snāyati* ‘wraps,’ Lat. *nuit* glossed by ‘operuit, texit.’ The word *náhus* belongs more closely with *náhyati* ‘binds, wraps,’ while Gr. *νύχα* has the vowel color of *nuit*. Lat. *niger* ‘black’ and *noegeum* ‘amiculi genus’ attest the ēy- diphthong. In all this it has been assumed that the night was the “binder” or “wrapper up” of the day (cf. Am. Jr. Phil. xxv. 386, note 2). The base for “snow,” with a different final guttural, *s)nē(y)-gwh-*, has a cognate meaning, snow being conceivable as that which “wraps” (covers) the earth: cf. also Avest. *vafra-*: ‘snow’: the root *vap-* “to strew, weave.”

### 3. vedhás, ‘worshipper, pious; faithful, true.’

Uhlenbeck in his etymological lexicon groups together *vidátham* (with deaspiration) ‘congregation, assembly,’ *vidháti* ‘worships, honors, dedicates (to a god),’ and *vedhás* as defined above. For none of these words does he suggest further cognates, not even Avestan ones.

In view of the uncertainty in some few Sanskrit words, even the oldest (cf. Whitney, *Verb Roots*, sub the root *vṛh*, and Wackernagel, *Altind. Gram.*, § 161), between *b* and *v*, we may provisionally etymologize on our words as though they began with *b*. Then if we set down \**bedhás-* ‘fidus, pius,’ it becomes immediately apparent that \**bedhás* and *fidus* are etymological cognates, which differ only in their stems, the former being an -es/-os- stem, the latter an -e-/o- stem. However, it must be observed that in AV. xix. 3. 4 the stem *védha* is found in a

variant reading for *védya*, while in old Latin *fidusta* (from \**fidos-to-*) occurs, defined by Paulus as “a fide denominata, ea quae maximae fidei erant,” a definition that would lead us to infer an Italic stem \**fidos-*: cf. also *foedus* and *cofoedusti*.

The derivation of *vedhás* here suggested also accounts for *vidátham*, if etymologically defined by “federation.” But *vidháti* presents a harder problem. It would not be very well defined by *πείθει*, but is fairly well matched by Germ. *betet*, *beten* and *bitten*, *being*, according to many,<sup>1</sup> cognate with *πείθει*, *fudit*. But if Kern is right in referring these German words to Skr. *bádhate* ‘premit’ (cf. the citation of the footnote), then it might be necessary provisionally to separate *vidháti* from *vedhás*, and rather put it in a group with *bádhate*. I have tried, however, in Am. Jr. Phil. xxvi. 179 ff., to reunite *πείθει* and *bádhate* under the still remoter base *bhē(y)-d(h)* ‘to split><splice.’ The semantic questions involved will now justify, I hope, a somewhat more detailed treatment, àpropos of the problem presented by *vedhás* for *bedhás*:

Beside the root *bheidh* ‘to convince’—though this meaning is far from being primitive—stands a root *bheid* ‘to split.’ My thesis is that these roots were originally but one. The variation of aspirate and sonant at the end of roots with nasal infixes is far too common a phenomenon to be called in question, and the nasal inflexion of Lat. *findit* ‘splits,’ Skr. *bhinátti*, *bhindánti*<sup>2</sup> fulfills the conditions. Further, a nasal inflexion of *bheidh* seems attested by Alb. *bint* ‘I persuade,’ if they are right who connect it with Gr. *πείθει*.<sup>3</sup>

If thus on the formal side we may regard *bheidh*-/ *bheid* as one root, it remains to bring in accord the figurative meaning of *bheidh* ‘to convince’ and the direct sense ‘to split’ attested for

<sup>1</sup> E. g., Osthoff, cited in Uhlenbeck’s *got. Woert*, s. v. *bidjan*; Brugmann, *Grundr.* i. § 589; Kluge, *Etym. Woert.* s.vv.; Skeat’s *Concise Etym. Dict.*, s.v. *bid*.

<sup>2</sup> It is entirely within the bounds of probability that *bheid-* ‘to split’ has been affected by a group-association with the root of Lat. *scindit*, Skr. *chinátti*, *chindánti*.

<sup>3</sup> So, among others, Brugmann, in his *Grundriss*, and Prellwitz, *Woert.*, s.v. *πείθω*. G. Meyer, *Alban. Woert.*, s.v. *bint*, derives from *bhendh*, which is, in my opinion, itself but a derivative of *bhē(y)dh-*; see Am. Jr. Phil. xxvi. 181.

bheid.<sup>1</sup> If we define Lat. fidus by ‘open(ed), frank, sincere, loyal’ we see how it may be cognate with findit ‘splits, opens.’ Similarly we may define the Homeric idiom *πειθεῖν φρέας* (*θυμόν*) *τινί* (*τινος*) by ‘to open one’s mind, convince,’ comparing our own idiom “to open one’s eyes;”<sup>2</sup> fidit and *πέποιθε* may be rendered by ‘opens (one’s own heart) to (another), trusts.’ The concrete sense of ‘splits’ is perhaps retained in Iliad 15, 26 *πεπιθούσα* *θνέλλας*, which may be defined by ‘findens procellas.’ The locution *μισθῷ πειθεῖν* ‘to bribe’ is very like the Sanskrit compound dāna-bhinnas ‘bestochen, bribed.’

To Lat. foedus I assign a semantic development somewhat different from that exhibited by fidus ‘true.’ In Sanskrit the ptc. bhinnás means not only ‘split, opened,’ but is defined in the lexicon of Boehltingk by “verbünden mit, hängend-, haftend an;” cf. vi-bhinnás “unzertrennlich verbünden mit,” sambhinatti “zusammen bringt, in Berührung bringt, verbindet, vermengt, sich zu jemandem gesellt,” bhiduras “in nahe Berührung tretend—sich vermengend, sich vermischtend mit,” bhittis “a woven mat” (: Lat. fides ‘strings, a lyre’). With these words Lat. foedus ‘truce, league, compact’ accords in definition and they show that in Sanskrit derivatives, at least, the root bhid- has developed the connotation ‘to join.’ Similar is Eng. splices ‘joins (split rope-ends),’ whose derivation from splits is clear; also, in the language of weavers and rope-makers, Germ. scheren ‘to cut, shear’ has acquired the sense of ‘spannen;’ cf. also Eng. pieces ‘to join <pieces> together.’ The semantic opposition of “to split” and “to join” is only apparent, and comparable with the conflict found in the pair sticks ‘stecht’ and sticks ‘steckt’ (cf. also stitches ‘stecht, stickt;’ and see Kluge’s *Woert.* s.v. *stechen*).

But in demonstrating a root bheid(h) ‘to split,’ with the connotation ‘to join,’ the last word has not yet been said for foedus ‘truce.’ Touching foedus, I think of some primitive form of contract by indenture, some breaking of a tessera hospitalis, in which the breaking of the token was the chief symbolic act of

<sup>1</sup> I share Uhlenbeck’s doubts whether Goth. beidan can be directly connected with Lat. fidit ‘trusts.’ But in view of MHG. stecken ‘to remain fast, stick, bide’ we may connect beidan, Eng. bide directly with bheid(h) to split, pierce.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Fr. résoudre ‘to persuade,’ from Lat. resolvere ‘to open up’ (?).

the treaty-making. Thus do we best account for the idiom ὅρκια πιστὰ ταμέν 'foedus ferire, icere, percutere,' which lends itself to the interpretation "symbola <pactionis> fissifacere" rather than to "foederis causa <hostiam> sacrificare" No doubt, however, the cutting up of the animal sacrificed for distribution among the compact-makers was a part of the ceremonial (cf. Aristophanes, Lysis., 192; ? Vergil, Aen. 8. 641).

Returning now to vedhás 'fidus,' I conjecture that its orthography with v for b was primarily due to the association of forms of b(h)eidh 'to split, pierce' (cf. Goth. beidan, Eng. bide, Gr. πεπιθύωσα' as explained above) with forms of the Sanskrit root vyadh vidh 'to pierce' (cf. Lat. di-vidit); or, to put it concretely, I conjecture that \*bedhás 'apertus, aperto <pectore>,' 'fidus' has been assimilated to viddhás 'di-visus, apertus;' though it is of course not to be denied that vedhás, defined by 'apertus, etc.' is susceptible to immediate derivation from vídh-yati 'peirces.'

#### 4. vádhri.

The close kinship of vádhri and its Greek synonym *ἱθόπις* 'τομίας, castratus' is not to be called in question, despite their phonetic divergence. The phonetic difficulty is resolved by deriving vádhri from the Skr. root vadhi 'to beat, slay,' and *ἱθόπις* from a base widh-, found in Skr. vídhyati 'pierces,' Lat. di-vidit 'divides,' and further attested, I believe, in *ἱσθμός* (from \*widh-tmos, with -tmos from the root tem), '(mare) dividens.' The parallelism of vádhris (\*wédhris) and *ἱθόπις* (wídhris) throws light on the Skr. root vyadh (not attested in RV.), which I take to be a blend of the root vidh (with grade forms in vedh) and the root vadhi.

#### 5. sprśáti 'touches, grasps, feels, besprinkles.'

Uhlenbeck (ai. Woert. s.v.) finds no sure cognates for sprśáti, but mentions the possibility that Goth. faurhts 'fearful' (without s-) is identical with the ptc. sprṣṭá 'touched, stirred, moved.' [Professor Hopkins calls my attention to the fact that sprṣṭá appears as prṣṭá in RV. i. 98. 2.] I doubt not, however, that

---

<sup>1</sup> On the close correspondence of Latin and Sanskrit in parts of their vocabulary, see Kretschmer, *Einleitung*, 125, ff.

Gr. *σπαράσσει* ‘tears, rends, mangles; mulcat’ is cognate with spršáti ‘touches; mulcet,’ cf. Lat. tangit ‘mulcet, mulcat.’ Goth. faurhts leans to the violent sense of ‘mulcat;’ as a semantic parallel we may compare Gr. *ἐκτλαγεῖς* <‘terror-> smitten.’

Wharton (*Etyma Latina*) sets down spurcus as a cognate of spršáti, and I believe this to be correct. We may again illustrate by derivatives of tangit, viz., contaminat, contingit ‘defiles,’ contactus ‘defiled;’ cf. also tangit ‘smears.’ The German word ferch ‘dung’ (without *s*-) perhaps belongs more closely with spurcus. With these we might group Lat. porcus, supposing the pig to have been named (1) ‘the dirty creature,’ and not (2) ‘the rooter’ (*porca* ‘furrow’). Still another possibility for porcus is (3) ‘spotted, dark,’ cf. Skr. pŕšni ‘spotted, a cow,’ Gr. πέρκος, πέρκνός (‘spotted), dark,’ πέρκη ‘perch’ (a dark or spotted fish, cf. our fish-name of “spot”). There is no inconsistency between (1) and (3), ‘dirty’ and ‘spotted’ being closely related notions, as Lat. maculosus, e. g., shows. And if porcus meant ‘rooter’ (2), it may still be a cognate of *σπαράσσει* ‘tears, rends.’ I see no reason to doubt, either, that pršaní, defined by Boehltingk as “sich anschmiegend, zärtlich” (mulcens) belongs with spršáti (cf. also Whitney, *Roots, Verb-Forms*, etc., etc., sub prš), cf. upa-spršáti “zärtlich berührt, liebkost.” With this group we may classify the cognates of Lat. procus ‘suitor,’ precatur ‘entreats,’<sup>1</sup> presses (a suit, request); lacescit, flagitat.’

## 6. khudáti ‘futuit.’

Uhlenbeck defines khudáti by “stösst hinein (kaprthám, sapam), and (s)khidáti by “reisst, stösst, drückt.” No cognate of khudáti seems to have been pointed out.<sup>2</sup> If the long diphthong gradation -ě(y)-/-ő(w), already referred to in this paper, is correctly assumed, then khudáti and khidáti go back to a common root (see Am. Jr. Phil. xxvi. 396). So far as signification goes, khudáti would seem but a specialization of khidáti, and we might explain its vocalism as something individual, due, to use the metaphor introduced by Bloomfield (IF. iv. 78), to a blend of khidáti and its synonym tudáti ‘stösst, sticht, stachelt.’

<sup>1</sup> Eng. entreats derives from Lat. tractat ‘handles;’ cf. further, Goth. bidjan: Skr. bádhate ‘premit’ (supra, p. 412).

<sup>2</sup> But now cf. Prellwitz, *Woert.* <sup>2</sup> s.v. κίσθως; I would derive κίσθως from khudhtos, Lat. cunnus from khudhnos or khudnos: base khud(h).

But the infection of khidáti by tudáti may as well have begun in the primitive period as in the separate life of Sanskrit. Uhlenbeck remarks s.v. khidáti, "verwantschaft mit chinátti is nicht undenkbar." In Latin both (per-)scindere (= chinátti) and pertundere occur in the special sense of khudáti,<sup>1</sup> the former in Priap. 15. 5, 54, 77. 13, and the latter in Catullus 32. 11. If scindit and tundit thus cross meanings in Latin, we have some confirmation of the supposed association of ideas that changed khidáti to khudáti under the influence of tudáti.

If Lat. cūdit 'strikes, beats' corresponds with Skr. khudáti 'stösst hinein,' the recognition of the Italic cognate would forbid us to regard khudáti as khidáti inflected by tudáti. It would not forbid us to suspect that primitive khudéti is khidéti, with the vowel color of tudéti, though we should be bound to admit three roots meaning 'to strike, thrust, pierce, split,' whose weakest forms are; 1) (s)khid<sup>2</sup>, 2 (s)khud, 3 (s)tud, (cf. Uhlenbeck, *op. cit.*, s. v., tomáras). The derivation of (2) from (1), inflected in its vowel color by (3), is purely glottogonic; not in any case a phonetic question, but rather a psychological question. Provisionally, leaving out the possibility that khūdáti is cognate with Lat. cūdit (: Germ. *hauen*, cf. Brugmann, Grund. I<sup>2</sup> § 639), we may include khudáti / khidáti among cases like those pointed out by Bloomfield in the essay referred to. Ultimately, perhaps, a psychological treatment of the vowel alternation in the spirit of Wundt's *Die Sprache* (I<sup>1</sup>, p. 335 ff.) may be arrived at.

## 7. Skr. ámbaram.

Uhlenbeck asserts that no satisfactory explanation has been advanced for ámbaram, but it seems to me that an easy one lies at hand. The meanings we have to account for are (1) ambitus, vicinia, (2) amictus. It is phonetically allowable to connect amb- with ἀμφί, Lat. ambi-, cf. Skr. ámbu / ámbhas 'water' for the variation b / bh after nasals. By this explanation ámbaram (subst.) is morphologically comparable with ávara-

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Gr. κρούειν, which occurs in the same special sense.

<sup>2</sup> Strong form (s)khēyd (: Lith. skēdžiu, Lat. caedit, see Hirt, Ablaut. 67) : cf. Amphitruo, 159, quasi incudem caedant, where incudem caedant partakes of the nature of the etymological figure, as does the commoner locution incudem tundere.

'lower,' ápara- 'further' (adj.): ámbara- means 'the surrounding.' For the sense 'amictus,' note the "roundabout" of the sailor, and the style of cloak called "circular." Compare too Sanskrit vásah paridhánam.

### 8. Pratíciḥ in RV. iv. 3. 2d (B.).

Agni is summoned in this stanza to a fire kindling. The general purport is clear, but there is a verbal difficulty in the last pāda,

imá u te svapāka pratíciḥ,

to wit, as to what substantive is to be supplied with pratíciḥ. Sāyaṇa supplies 'flames' or 'hymns,' Ludwig 'gentes' or 'cives' or even the 'ladles of the sacrifice,' and Grassmann supplies 'libations,' while Griffith follows Sāyana. In support of the native interpretation I cite vii. 39. 1b (A)

pratíci jūrnír devátātim eti,

"The toward flame goes to the godhead."

Here the situation is that the fire has been kindled and the flames ascend. In iv. 3. 2, Agni is invited to come and kindle the fire and the 'toward <flames>' are the 'expectant flames' unless, instead of jūrnáyah, we supply samídhah 'kindlings, faggots.' As to svapāka, Ludwig's 'selbst garer' suggests to me 'self-cooker, self-kindler.'